

Today's Topics:

ARRL (2 msgs)
ARRL NR 89: PACKET REMINDER
dual banders (2m & 70cm)
Holy Code Practice!

Laws against scanners in cars?? [was Re: Radios in crime (was: Re: (#1 in series)
Listen to store security guards catch shoplif (2 msgs)

Noise on the air and in rec.ham-radio
rec.ham-radio is out of control
rec.scanners

Santec (ENCOMM) ST-20T mods wanted

Wanted: Unix based satellite prediction program - source preferred

Date: 6 Dec 89 07:33:25 GMT

From: ka9q.bellcore.com!karn@bellcore.com (Phil Karn)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <18491@bellcore.bellcore.com>

In article <7327@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:

>... That being said, I agree with the views expressed. I don't care if
>you like it or not, modification for out of band service (MARS and CAP
>excepted) seems to be illegal. What gives hams the right to do this?

I don't mind saying that I've modified several of my Icom radios to provide out-of-band coverage.

When I got my IC-751A HF transceiver, I clipped the wire that enabled the transmitter in the general coverage mode. Why? It turns out that the computer interface doesn't allow you to change bands. However, the radio's firmware considers the 0.150 to 30 MHz "general coverage" mode to be a single band, distinct from the individual amateur bands. Therefore I could do exactly what I wanted by simply enabling the transmitter and always operating in general coverage mode.

In my IC-271A (2m all mode transceiver) I used a diode to simulate a press of a non-existent "band change" button to allow the transceiver to tune all the way from 140 to 150 MHz. Why? Because I wanted to listen to the MIR transmissions on 143.625 MHz, and this was outside the radio's original coverage range of 143.8 to 148.2 MHz.

On my IC-32A (2m/70cm handheld) I enabled all of the out-of-band receive and transmit mods. Why? Because that was the only way to gain the ability to transmit within the 70cm amateur band below 440 MHz.

So you see, Bob, there are some perfectly legitimate reasons an amateur might want to modify an amateur rig for extended frequency coverage that have absolutely nothing to do with a desire to operate illegally. Modifying

an amateur transceiver to *enable* it to transmit out of band is perfectly legal as long as you don't *actually* transmit out of band.

Phil

Date: 6 Dec 89 04:54:15 GMT
From: rochester!rit!ultb!cep4478@PT.CS.CMU.EDU (C.E. Piggott)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <1701@ultb.isc.rit.edu>

In article <24896@ubvax.UB.Com> hardwick@ubvax.UB.Com (Bob Hardwick) writes:

[stuff deleted]
>>[forwarded from packet]
>>Locally we provide the FCC enforcement section call signs of anyone
>>requesting how to or trying to stimulate a data base on illegal mods.
>>FCC type acceptance is the bottom consideration, as well as common sense.

...
>>Mike N6KZB @ N6KZB Orange Section ARRL ASM.
>>Telecommunications Engineer II, RCOFD.

>If this is what the ARRL is doing with our dues money then
>the ARRL has just lost a member.

I agree with you completely, Bob. But I do not believe that this is a league policy. The league does some stupid things, but they have better ways to keep occupied than looking for things that are largely a problem OUTSIDE of the Amateur Service. Secondly, it occurs to me in ALL of the radio-comm services that the FCC does not respond to a problem that it does not see; if a member of a volunteer fire dept. uses a TH-215, well yeah it's illegal because of type certification, but I really doubt the FCC would care all that much. Finally, the tone of N2KZB's packet message does not sound like something the league would put out, both in the tone and the language. The November QST indicates that K6LKN is the Assistant Section Manager for the Orange Section, which suggests to me that if N2KZB is indeed the current ASM there, he's probably new at it.

Chris N2JGW
cep4478@ultb.isc.rit.edu

Date: 6 Dec 89 02:52:32 GMT
From: n8emr!gws@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Gary Sanders)
Subject: ARRL NR 89: PACKET REMINDER

Message-ID: <1375@n8emr.UUCP>

```
=====
|           Relayed from packet radio via           |
| N8EMR's Ham BBS, 614-457-4227 (1200/2400/19.2 telebit,8N1) |
=====
```

ARRL BULLETIN 89 (ARLB089) 12/5/89

ARRL HQ REMINDS US AMATEURS THAT UNATTENDED HF PACKET OPERATION IS PRESENTLY PROHIBITED BY PART 97 RULES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE STATIONS SPECIFICALLY GRANTED WRITTEN SPECIAL TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATION ON SPECIFIC PORTIONS OF FOUR HF BANDS. NO UNATTENDED STA OPERATION IS ALLOWED ON TEN METERS. STATIONS WITHOUT PACKET STA AUTHORIZATION MUST ADHERE TO NORMAL ATTENDED CONTROL OPERATOR REQUIREMENTS. AR

--

Gary W. Sanders (gws@n8emr or ...!osu-cis!n8emr!gws), 72277,1325
N8EMR @ W8CQK (ip addr) 44.70.0.1 [Ohio AMPR address coordinator]
HAM/SWL/SCANNER BBS (1200/2400/PEP) 614-457-4227
Voice: 614-457-4595 (eves/weekends)

Date: 6 Dec 89 05:52:27 GMT
From: uc!shamash!vtcqa@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (VTC)
Subject: dual banders (2m & 70cm)
Message-ID: <14723@shamash.cdc.com>

In article <2831@cygnus.mmsac.UUCP>, david@mmsac.UUCP (David Kensiski) writes:

> Yesterday, my wife asked me what I wanted for Christmas. I told her I
> wanted a dual band radio for my car. Then she asked what model. All
> I could say was, "Uh... I remember a Kenwood... or was it Yeasu..."
>

> So, I am looking for information about the various dual band mobile
> radios that are currently on the market. I would like to know the
> features and prices, but more importantly, what kind of good or bad
> experiences have you had.
>

I purchased a Yaesu FT470 about 2 months ago, and overall I am quite satisfied. One interesting feature is that you may monitor both 2m and 70cm at the same time. There is a 'mixer' control at the top which determines how much volume each band gets - in the middle its equal volume, all the way left its all UHF, all the way right and its VHF. This is a handy feature. It is also a pretty compact compared to the other units I looked at. The only real shocker I had when I entered the handi talkie world was that the little buggers are REALLY thirsty for the juice. (xlation: they draw a lot of

current) I picked up the optional FNB-12 battery pack. Its 12v @ 500 mAh. This gives me a 5 watt output, but its really only useful for about 45 minutes. Thats if you talk for 3 mins, then listen for three, talk for three, etc. You really have to stick to low power as much as possible to get the most enjoyment out of it. One thing that helps is if you use an earphone for rcv. The difference in current draw for increasing volume levels is very surprising.

BEWARE: You are about to get pounced on royale about the infamous intermod problem of the 470. It's true. I get to hear the weather on most of my favorite repeaters. If you turn the squelch down it usually goes away, and you can also get rid of it by re-orientating the antenna for a moment. It's not as bad as people make it out to be. I live in Minneapolis, a major city. I know other users who are a little more rural, and they have no problem at all with it. Also, Yaesu will fix it for free if you send it to them. I haven't sent mine in yet, because its not that big of a deal. Supposedly the new ones out have this problem fixed. I would call Yaesu and ask them what serial numbers to look for, if this is true.

73's

Jeff - NR0D

Date: 5 Dec 89 22:46:23 GMT
From: cadnetix.COM!cadnetix!rusty@uunet.uu.net (Rusty Carruth)
Subject: Holy Code Practice!
Message-ID: <10466@cadnetix.COM>

In article <128395@sun.Eng.Sun.COM> sxn%ingersoll@Sun.COM (Stephen X. Nahm) writes:

>...
> "Fix our thoughts on Jesus, the apostle and high
> priest whom we confess. Be faithful to the one who
> appointed him - just as Moses was faithful in all
> God's use."
>

Howdy again, net! Some folks had commented that they thought that this was part of the Bible. Sorry, but its not part of the 'standard' New Testament (and you can be *sure* its not part of the Old Testament! :-))

Now, it may be a 'paraphrase' of something Paul wrote. In any case, I'd think, as someone else pointed out, that the old KJV (King James Version) would be a better thing to send, as its NOT copyrighted, it IS available in machine-readable form, and its real easy to find a copy to check how well you received it...

Just my \$.02 (Why in the world does ascii NOT include a 'cent' sign?
Oh, well :-))

---Join the usenet un-net, 28.410 and/or 28.390(+/-) 1600Z to 1700Z saturdays!
Rusty Carruth. Radio: N7IKQ ^^ or later :-)
DOMAIN: rusty@cadnetix.com UUCP:{uunet,boulder}!cadnetix!rusty
home: POB. 461, Lafayette CO 80026

Date: 5 Dec 89 14:09:54 GMT
From: att!tsdiag!ocpt!ccop1!wilson@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (<att!tsdiag!ocpt!ccop1!
wilson@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU>)
Subject: Laws against scanners in cars?? [was Re: Radios in crime (was: Re: (#1 in
series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplif
Message-ID: <268@ccop1.ocpt.ccur.com>

The current NJ Scanner law (written in 1936!) prohibits installation
of any receiving device capable of receiving government, police or
fire communications in any vehicle unless you're a government official
fireman, police officer or emergency squad member. (This is a paraphrase,
I have the full wording at home). You may have such a receiver if you
have a letter authorising such from the chief of police of your township
or county. Legislation changing this to just prohibiting the use of
a receiver to commit a crime or interfere with law enforcement is
currently in the respective committees of the Assembly and Senate.

As the law is written, most modern amateur VHF or UHF is technically
illegal as it can tune public safety bands. As a practical manner,
the law is rarely enforced unless you are doing something else illegal
at the same time.

Whether the law is actually enforceable to a court challenge is another
matter. The ARRL is considering asking the FCC to issue a position
on whether states have the right to regulate radio receivers or whether Federal
pre-emption rules.

Incidentally, I have a letter from my chief of police so I'm "legal"!

73

Gary Wilson, WB2B00
ARRL Mercer County EC

Date: 6 Dec 89 17:39:54 GMT

From: att!cbnewsj!kfr@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (k.redden)
Subject: Laws against scanners in cars?? [was Re: Radios in crime (was: Re: (#1 in series) Listen to store security guards catch shoplif
Message-ID: <2679@cbnewsj.ATT.COM>

In article <268@ccop1.ocpt.ccur.com> wilson@ccop1.ocpt.ccur.com (<wilson>) writes:
>

> The current NJ Scanner law (written in 1936!) prohibits installation
> of any receiving device capable of receiving government,
> Legislation changing this to just prohibiting the use of
> a receiver to commit a crime or interfere with law enforcement is
> currently in the respective committees of the Assembly and Senate.
>

The NJ legislature only has about 3 more sessions scheduled before the end of it's current term. On January 9th, all bills not yet enacted are flushed out of the system, and would have to be re-introduced during the new term to get them considered.

Kevin Redden
WB2ZLF (201) 576-3659

Date: 6 Dec 89 19:15:46 GMT
From: shelby!neon!bodega.stanford.edu!paulf@decwrl.dec.com (Paul Flaherty)
Subject: Noise on the air and in rec.ham-radio
Message-ID: <1989Dec6.191546.4130@Neon.Stanford.EDU>

I think we could end the constant legalese squabbles by defining on-the-air criticism of operating practices as "not within good amateur practice". Let's face it folks, if you REALLY have something to say, isn't it best said with a QSL card (AFTER you've cooled down for an hour or so)?

A proposed addition to Paul M. Segal's "Amateur's Code" (found in any ARRL Handbook):

SEVEN

The Amateur is Tolerant...He does not criticize the operations of others over the air, unless they endanger lives or property. He prefers instead to conduct constructive criticism privately, in a thoughtful manner.

If you think someone's operation is illegal, use snail-mail or email; don't waste usenet or rf bandwidth bothering everyone.

As an example, consider "Scanner" Bob Parnass' posting on store security. If you didn't think this was legal or ethical, you should have sent him email.

There was no need to start a discussion on the merits of knowing security frequencies. IF you don't know how to send email, RTFM.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Unix could use a more user-friendly interface.
->paulf@shasta.Stanford.EDU | Does anyone have a card punch handy?"

Date: 6 Dec 89 05:06:30 GMT
From: rochester!rit!ultb!cep4478@louie.udel.edu (C.E. Piggott)
Subject: rec.ham-radio is out of control
Message-ID: <1702@ultb.isc.rit.edu>

I am not the soapbox-preaching type, but I think that rec.ham-radio is *VERY* out of control. The volume of traffic has gotten high while the content has degraded to petty bickering and text that has deviated unexcusably from the purpose of this newsgroup.

I would like to remind new users of the group that there are many, many pages of text with regard to network ettiquette. (A "new user" is defined as anybody who is not familiar with these procedures).

Let's try some 'passive resistance', please; think twice about posting. Is it about some aspect of HAM RADIO? Or did the article you are responding to remind you of what happened last time you were in Paris with your HT? The distinction that I am getting at is that this newsgroup is NOT the same as being on the air; when you are using a ham radio, you can talk about what you like. This newsgroup is for talking about ham radio. period.

--

Christopher E. Piggott, A.R.S. N2JGW
cep4478@ultb.isc.rit.edu
..!rutgers!rochester!ritcv!ultb!cep4478

Date: 6 Dec 89 19:46:15 GMT
From: chuq@apple.com (Chuq Von Rospach)
Subject: rec.scanners
Message-ID: <37046@apple.Apple.COM>

MROWEN@STLAWU.BITNET (Mike Owen W9IP) writes:

>Bob, KA1GT, suggests that the voluminous scanner information
>currently occupying the net should be distributed elsewhere.

>I most firmly agree. This is rec.Ham radio, after all.
>Scanner fans have every right to air their views, discuss
>whatever they want to, distribute frequencies, etc.

If the ham radio folks don't want you scanner folks, then come on over to
rec.radio.shortwave. You're welcome to join us until you decide you want
your own group. (This is, in fact, one reason why rec.radio.shortwave
was created was to get away from just this attitude (I know it's just a few
hams, but it certainly doesn't make me want to learn code any time soon...)

>But
>if this net is for ham radio, that's what its postings should
>contain.

Come join us over in the other group. We'll happily make you welcome.

--

Chuq Von Rospach <+> chuq@apple.com <+> [This is myself speaking]

When it comes to matters outside your specialties, you are consistently and
brilliantly stupid [....] with respect to matters you haven't studied and
have had no experience basing your opinions on casual gossip [....] and
plain misinformation -- unsuspected because you haven't attempted to verify it.

-- Robert Heinlein to J.W. Campbell, Jr. 1941

Date: 6 Dec 89 05:49:51 GMT
From: unsvox!arrakis.nevada.edu!storkus@uunet.uu.net (Mike Storke (N7MSD))
Subject: Santec (ENCOMM) ST-20T mods wanted
Message-ID: <1097@unsvox.NEVADA.EDU>

Anyone who has mods for a Santec ST-20T handheld 2 meter radio, could you
please email them to me. There are currently no mods for it in the mods data-
base at HAMSTER. Thanks, and 73's

Mike P. Storke, N7MSD NOTICE: Use my HOME QTH address until mid January.
Inet: storkus@arrakis.nevada.edu Packet: KF7TI @ LAS:K7WS-1 or VEGAS:P0TOSI
Snailmail: Box 6 Minden, Nv 89423:HOME QTH. And I claim EVERYTHING I SAY!!
"Pascal: The Handcuff of the programmer. I WANT MY C!!!!!!!!!!!!!"

Date: 6 Dec 89 02:26:04 GMT
From: asuvax!anasaz!john@handies.ucar.edu (John Moore)
Subject: Wanted: Unix based satellite prediction program - source preferred
Message-ID: <978@anasaz.UUCP>

In article <6337@pitt.UUCP> hoffman@speedy.cs.pitt.edu (Bob Hoffman) writes:
>file PD1:<MSDOS.HAMRADIO>ORBIT23.ARC.1. I've used this on Unix
I can't do ftp (on usenet, not internet). Can someone send it to me?

--

John Moore (NJ7E) mcdphx!anasaz!john asuvax!anasaz!john
(602) 861-7607 (day or eve) long palladium, short petroleum
7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253
The 2nd amendment is about military weapons, NOT JUST hunting weapons!

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #981
